IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS HOUSTON DIVISION

IN RE: \$ CASE NO. 20-33948-H1-11

§ (JOINTLY ADMINISTERED)

FIELDWOOD ENERGY, LLC and \$ HOUSTON, TEXAS DYNAMIC OFFSHORE RESOURCES, \$ TUESDAY,

\$ AUGUST 4, 2020 LLC,

> § 1:28 P.M. TO 3:50 P.M. DEBTORS.

TELEPHONIC FIRST DAY HEARINGS

BEFORE THE HONORABLE MARVIN ISGUR UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY JUDGE

APPEARANCES: SEE NEXT PAGE

COURTROOM DEPUTY/ERO: RECORDED THROUGH COURTSPEAK

NO LOG NOTES

(Audio distortion and glitches noted.)

TRANSCRIPTION SERVICE BY:

JUDICIAL TRANSCRIBERS OF TEXAS, LLC 935 Eldridge Road, #144 Sugar Land, TX 77478 281-277-5325 www.judicialtranscribers.com

Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording, transcript produced by transcription service.

JUDICIAL TRANSCRIBERS OF TEXAS, LLC

TELEPHONIC APPEARANCES:

FOR THE DEBTORS, FIELDWOOD ENERGY, LLC, ET AL.:

WEIL GOTSHAL & MANGES, LLP Alfredo R. Perez, Esq. Clifford W. Carlson, Esq. 700 Louisiana Street Suite 1700 Houston, TX 77002 713-546-5040

> WEIL GOTSHAL & MANGES, LLP Matthew Barr, Esq. Moshe L. Fink, Esq. Jessica Liou, Esq. 767 Fifth Avenue New York, NY 10153 212-310-8010

FOR GOLDMAN SACHS BANK, USA:

VINSON & ELKINS, LLP William L. Wallander, Esq. 2001 Ross Avenue, Suite 3900 Dallas, TX 75201 214-220-7905

FOR US SPECIALTY INSURANCE COMPANY:

LOCKE LORD, LLP
Philip Eisenberg, Esq.
600 Travis Street, Suite 600
Houston, TX 77002
713-226-1304

FOR THE AD HOC GROUP OF SECURED LENDERS:

DAVIS POLK & WARDWELL, LLP Natasha Tsiouris, Esq. 450 Lexington Avenue New York, NY 10017 212-450-4580

FOR APACHE CORPORATION:

HUNTON ANDREW KURTH, LLP Robin Russell, Esq. 600 Travis Street, Suite 4200 Houston, TX 77002 713-220-4200

TELEPHONIC APPEARANCES (CONT'D):

FOR THE US TRUSTEE:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE OFFICE OF THE US TRUSTEE

Hector Duran, Esq.

515 Rusk Avenue, Suite 3516

Houston, TX 77002

713-718-4650

(Please see also electronic appearances.)

INDEX

WITNESSES:	<u>Direct</u>	Cross	<u>Redirect</u>	Recross
JOHN-PAUL HANSON				
By Mr. Perez	28	•		•
By Mr. Eisenberg	•	32	•	39
By the Court	38		•	•

EXHIBITS: <u>Marked</u> <u>Offered</u> <u>Admitted</u>

(None offered.)

. . .

HOUSTON, TEXAS; TUESDAY, AUGUST 4, 2020; 2:10 P.M.

THE COURT: All right. We are going to call the Fieldwood case. It is first day hearings, it is Case Number 20-33948. We've taken electronic appearances. Let's start with Debtor's counsel. I'll have Debtor's counsel to make any opening statement that it wishes to make and then we will move on from there and allow other people to make opening statements, then we'll move into an evidentiary record.

Mr. Perez, go ahead, please.

MR. PEREZ: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Alfredo Perez. Can you hear me?

THE COURT: Yes, sir, I can.

MR. PEREZ: Your Honor, before we get started I wanted to express my profound condolences to the Court family. Today I was very saddened by the news this morning.

THE COURT: As we all were.

For those of you who that have not received the news, an individual that has been a long-term -- time member of the United States Trustee's Office passed away yesterday from COVID, and it's a really sad day here at the Court and I appreciate you bringing that up, and expressing your condolences not only to her family, but also to other members of the US Trustee's staff.

So, thank you, Mr. Perez.

MR. PEREZ: Thank you, Your Honor.

Your Honor, first of all we want to apologize for not being able to conclude all the filings in a more timely manner. We literally worked overnight to get the RSA finalized as well as the DIP motion. And, Your Honor, you know, had we been able to file this hours earlier, we would have. And we filed it as quickly as we could once the items were finalized. So we do ask for your indulgence. And obviously are prepared to understand, you know, the Court's -- any direction that the Court may have with respect to that.

Your Honor, we'll begin --

THE COURT: So just so you know where I am,

Mr. Perez, I did read both of the declarations that got filed.

I will tell you that the larger declaration, the one by your
- the head of your leadership team, I don't know that I

absorbed every sentence of that because I had to read it

pretty quickly while I was eating lunch, so reading the

motions without that didn't make as much sense as reading that

first. So I may need to take a little more time as we go

through orders to be sure that we get them done right. I have
though read them both completely, but not what I would call
thoroughly because of the press of time.

MR. PEREZ: Thank you, Your Honor. And we do apologize for that. Both Mr. Dane and Mr. Hanson (phonetics), who are our two declarants, are on the line, I can see their pictures, and we're certainly happy to submit them to cross-

examination or direct exam as the Court wishes to meet our evidentiary burden.

Your Honor, once again I've only been asked to do the joint administration which the Court has already granted, and I will turn it over to my partner, Mr. Barr, who will give a little introduction of the case. And then after that, Your Honor, we will move into the various substantive motions with the Court's permission.

THE COURT: Well, Mr. Barr, why don't we do that.

know that we have others that may want to make an opening

statement, Mr. Wallander has already asked to speak. So I

will start with you, but before we get into any evidence I

want to be sure that everyone else has a chance to make any

opening statement that they want to make.

Mr. Dane, I do see you there, and I did read you declaration. It just is taking a while to absorb it, it was a pretty heavy piece, that I understand why it took a little while to get it written.

So, Mr. Barr, let me get your line activated.

MR. PEREZ: And thank you, Your Honor. I think we're going to try one more time for Mr. Carlson to be the presenter.

THE COURT: All right. Will he present to Judge Jones or to me?

MR. PEREZ: Probably neither, Your Honor, based on

1 his track record. 2 (Laughter.) 3 THE COURT: Let's see, I am -- Mr. Barr. Mr. Barr, 4 I need you to press five star on your phone if you would, 5 please, so that I can get your audio going. 6 And, Mr. Carlson, I will pass the presenter role on 7 over to you. So, Mr. Carlson is now the presenter. Let me 8 get Mr. Barr's line activated. 9 Mr. Wallander, I see that you put your request to 10 speak down, but please feel free to raise it again when the 11 time comes. 12 (Pause in the proceedings.) 13 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Barr, we should have you 14 activated at this point. 15 MR. BARR: Thank you, Your Honor. It's Matt Barr 16 from Weil Gotshal. Can you hear me okay, Judge? 17 THE COURT: Yes, sir, I can. 18 MR. BARR: Great. Thank you. 19 And I apologize, Your Honor, I'm on a cell phone 20 unfortunately here in New Jersey. We had a power outage so 21 (glitch in the audio). 22 THE COURT: Actually, Mr. Barr, I can't hear you. 23 I heard him say he was on a cell phone and might 24 have a bad connection and that was all I heard. So what do 25 you want to do, Mr. Perez?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. PEREZ: Your Honor, they're having a power outage up there. Let's see if we can -- because of the hurricane, so maybe Mr. Barr could try again, otherwise I think I could probably take you through it. THE COURT: We'll certainly accommodate whatever you all need to do, and, Mr. Barr, do you want to give it another shot, and if not, do you want to just wait a few minutes. You all tell me what we can do. Mr. Barr, can you hear me? MR. BARR: (No audible response.) THE COURT: I don't think he's hearing anything. Oh, wait, his line got muted somehow and I'm going to -- maybe he dialed back in, let me try him again. Mr. Barr, let's try that again. MR. BARR: Yes. Can you hear me now, Judge? THE COURT: I can hear you, yeah. MR. BARR: Great. This time it wasn't Mr. Carlson's fault. I guess it was my fault, the Verizon up here in New Jersey. So good track record, but I do apologize, Judge, for being on the cell phone, and I guess it proved me right because we have a power outage up here in New Jersey given the storms. THE COURT: Yeah, may I --MR. BARR: I'm hoping you can hear me okay. THE COURT: Yeah, I can. I always hear that

hurricanes are worse in New York than they are in other parts of the country.

(Laughter.)

MR. BARR: (Glitch in the audio.)

THE COURT: You're gone again.

MR. PEREZ: Okay.

THE COURT: Mr. Perez, you better decide how you want to handle this. I don't mind if you want to wait a few minutes and let the storm pass and we'll come back, you tell me.

MR. PEREZ: No, we're fine. No, no, Your Honor, I think we can probably -- I think we can probably proceed. So if you would, can you -- so, Your Honor, I wanted to just give you a brief introduction to Fieldwood. As the Court is aware, this is our second Chapter 11 filing. We're a privately held company, and all of our assets are in the Gulf of Mexico. We're one of the very largest operators of offshore assets. We have over 300 operated platforms and it covers a huge expanse from the Texas border almost all the way to Alabama.

Your Honor, we have basically three sets of assets. We have the deep water assets, which we purchased from Apache in connection with the last bankruptcy. We also have what we refer to as the legacy Apache assets, which form the basis of the company. Those were purchased in 2012 and that's about — a little bit more than two-thirds of the what we call the

shelf assets. And, Your Honor, technically everything is on the shelf, but when we talk about shelf we're talking about shallow water as opposed to deep water. And then in addition to the Apache shelf assets we also have additional shelf assets. In fact, Your Honor, some of those were acquired from Sandridge, which I believe was in your court at one time.

So those are the three -- basically the three sets of assets that we have. We have approximately 635 employees in Houston and Lafayette, but the bulk of our employees and the bulk of the people that we retained are offshore in this vast, you know, in this vast region that we operate.

We have -- we are the operators, Your Honor, of over 95 percent of our asset base, and although we've had some very, very trying times earlier this year as a result of the commodity price, we still produce almost 80,000 barrels per day in the first three months of 2022 (sic).

Your Honor, one of our -- one of the things that this company has done very well is that we have an extensive plug and abandoning and decommissioning program. We probably plug and abandon more wells than most companies have in the Gulf, and we do that, you know, officially and in a very workman-like and efficient manner.

Turn to the next page.

Your Honor, this -- I know that you probably saw this in Mr. Dane's declaration, but this gives you an idea of

the expanse of our footprint in the Gulf and the various -- all of the various platforms and wells.

Turn to the next page.

So, Your Honor, after our 2018 bankruptcy, the company significantly de-levered and we nevertheless ended up with almost \$2 billion worth of debt, a little under \$2 billion worth of debt. We have picked a first lien that has a first lien, first out, and then the first lien term loan, which we referred to that, and then we have a second lien. Your Honor, this is a pictorial graph, I suspect we might come back to that at some time during the case, but it's probably a little too small to see on the screen.

So turn to the next page.

So why are we here. Your Honor, I think the Court is well aware just because of the volume of business that exists today in our bankruptcy courts in Houston that, kind of the combined effect of the decline in oil prices, many, many multiple of which happened over one weekend back in March or late February, as well as the impact of the global pandemic that really deteriorated -- have really deteriorated the price.

The company took very significant steps to mitigate this drop in commodity price, but they proved not to be sufficient. The company shut in 29 of the production platforms, there was reductions in force, all employees that

made over 150,000 took a 10 percent salary cut, and we implemented much stricter purchasing programs and vendor management programs. As a result of all of that and unfortunately the bad press, there was an article in the Wall Street Journal yesterday that we're about to imminently file bankruptcy which had some repercussions. Many of the vendors and the surety providers in which we have significant opt-outs have expressed their concern and have taken actions to either limit their exposure or obtain collateral.

Your Honor, our capital structure, we have the first lien, the first-out loans which are funded in the amount of 139 million. There is about 8- or \$9 million of letters of credit, so sometimes you will see that the FLFOs, as we refer to them, sometimes their exposure is 147 and that includes 139 million in funded debt plus the LC. The pre-petition first lien term loan we -- those are approximately a billion forty-three, and then our second lien term loans are a little over 500 million.

THE COURT: Let me interrupt you for a second.

MR. PEREZ: Sure, Your Honor.

THE COURT: This table --

MR. PEREZ: Yes.

THE COURT: -- I believe uses different nomenclature than in the declarations, and I just want to be sure that I've got the right liens with the right initials.

What is denominated on here as pre-petition first lien term

loans are the FLFOs in the declaration, and what are

denominated as the FLFO's are actually the FLTLs in the

first -
MR. PEREZ: Yeah.

THE COURT: -- in the declarations. And if I'm

incorrect about that, then I'm incorrect about what I figured

out when I was reading stuff. So I want to be sure that this

is different than what I read, but that I've got the right

actual structure in my mind.

MR. PEREZ: You absolutely do, Your Honor. I

apologize, but we were -- we just didn't have time to make

everything the same.

THE COURT: I'm not -- I'm not worried about it from that point of view, I'm worried about it to be sure I know what structure I'm dealing with.

MR. PEREZ: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: So I've got some first-out term loans of about 140 million, and I've got some regular term loans that are not first out that are about 1.1 billion --

MR. PEREZ: Right.

THE COURT: -- in that range.

MR. PEREZ: Correct, Your Honor. And just so the Court understands who we're talking about, the 140 million is primarily Goldman Sachs Cantor, primarily Goldman Sachs, and

that's represented by Mr. Wallander. Whereas, the billion one forty-three and the five eighteen, which are kind of together, they're represented by Davis Polk, Mr. Shuriat (phonetic), as well as Mr. Schaible. They represent those -- the entities, both below that. So those are the persons.

And the other key party is Apache, Your Honor, and that's represented by Ms. Robin Russell of Hunton Andrews & Kurth. So those are kind of the three parties-in-interest in this case.

So next page, please.

So, Your Honor, I think that this slide basically shows that, you know, beginning in March we began engaging with the lenders, we tried to so some management transactions, we entered into multiple forbearance agreements trying to come up with an out-of-court solution. We were unable to do that, and so we have forbearances literally through Sunday and then through yesterday in order to be able to file.

Back in June of this year Houlihan, who had been retained a couple of months earlier, actually started a base sales and marketing process for the deep water assets, and that marketing process is continuing and will be -- in essence be brought in parallel with the other milestones that we have in the case.

Next slide, please.

Honor, key to us is trying to in essence rationalize the three sets of assets. I think the fundamental cornerstone of our restructuring is going to be the transaction that we're going to do with Apache that's reflected in the Apache term sheet that was accepted. And the arm's length negotiations with Apache represented by counsel, represented by their investment advisor, that term sheet was signed last Friday, and we've been working together.

Second, Your Honor, we have an RSA with approximately 67-1/2 percent of our first lien term lenders. Here we use the other nomenclature. And approximately 25 percent of the second lien term lenders, and, Your Honor, many of those are cross-over lenders that have positions in both places. And they -- the first lien term lenders have provided

\$100 million of DIP financing that will be the subject of one of the motions.

The goal of these cases is obviously to maximize value, to preserve jobs and -- but a third -- a fourth very important party are the regulators of both BOEM and BSEE, and so are one of our key incentives to ensure that the P&A obligations are handled in a responsible manner, you know, with their consent and approval.

So turn to the next page, please.

So, Your Honor, in connection with the RSA we have certain milestones and basically I think that in essence we're going to run a dual fact process. One of the milestones will help, I'll highlight a couple of them. We did 75 days, we want to have definitive documentation with Apache. We also want to have a plan and Disclosure Statement to handle the bid procedures motion on 75 days. That basically gives us two and a half months. Then after that, Your Honor, we run, you know, depending on what path we go -- and, Your Honor, we take up both paths because if the trail that is currently contemplated is just of the deep water assets, so there will be other assets to be disposed of and to address and to reorganize.

So, Your Honor, we have in essence, you know, a nine-month process. We're hoping very much that we're able to, you know, exit bankruptcy in the first quarter of next year, we certainly don't want to be around for nine months. But we do have a sufficient time. A lot of the items that we're planning on doing, you know, are not dependent. We are in control, dependent on cooperation and agreement by other parties.

So with that, Your Honor, unless the Court has any questions, I would turn it over I think to anyone else.

THE COURT: Well, let me go back to Mr. Barr, and since you were having to sub for him, see if Mr. Perez blew it, Mr. Barr.

MR. BARR: Can you hear me okay, Judge? I want to make sure I'm getting this right.

THE COURT: I can because you haven't discounted now in about 20 minutes and you were disconnecting every minute or two before, so.

MR. BARR: And now it's sunny out, so I don't know what's going on. No, it was -- I had nothing else to cover other than just to remind Mr. Perez if I get cut off after other openings to make sure wee move the declarations into evidence, and then turn everything over to Mr. Carlson. But thank you, Judge, for asking.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

So I know that we did have some people that wanted to make comments. Mr. Wallander, let me go ahead and activate your line. Are you able to hear me all right, Mr. Wallander?

MR. WALLANDER: (No audible response.)

THE COURT: Mr. Wallander, if you have your own line muted, or just don't want to talk to me anymore, that's okay, but we're not hearing you.

MR. WALLANDER: I was on mute, Your Honor. I did that for appearances purposes. I don't have an opening statement. We are working with the Debtors and with the other first-day lenders to see if we can get something sorted out in the matter, and hopefully we'll work forward on a consensual basis with each other. Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Wallander, thank you. You did file your electronic appearance, so you have appeared, as has everyone that has does that. If anyone failed to do an electronic appearance, it's not too late, go ahead and do it.

Let me see who else might want to make a comment.

Mr. Eisenberg, I saw you watching and was surprised you were
being silent. So go ahead, please.

MR. EISENBERG: Your Honor, did you say my name?
THE COURT: I did, yes, sir.

MR. EISENBERG: Thank you, Your Honor. Philip
Eisenberg on behalf of the US Specialty Insurance Company. We
are one of the surety companies that extend over a billion
dollars in financial accommodations to Fieldwood in this
matter, Your Honor. And we're still trying to figure out what
happened. We understand you have to start somewhere, and
things have to get filed and people have to read things.

But we're just not sure yet what the Debtors are asking for today, and we certainly don't feel that on this short notice that our rights are being impaired in any way. I also represent a joint interest owner, WNP, and really haven't had time to look through the interim order to make sure that any of our lien rights, recoupment rights, set off rights and rights of that nature would also be fully preserved, and don't want to be -- have any marshaling issue on an interim order affect us.

We're listening very carefully here. We do see a little bit of a lack of transparency. We're reading as fast as we can, Your Honor, but in the budget we can't tell during the nine months what the company is proposing to do with regard to actually performing its current P&A obligations. We do know that they are a very good company and they do act very responsibly and they do their P&A, and having read what they have, I did see that they do have provisions for actually doing P&A during the process. But we don't have any transparency into what's going to happen there, Your Honor. It's very much like the first-day in the ATP hearing.

So I just wanted to kind of raise that with the Court right now because of the timing. And they've been at this for several months and we've had a couple of hours, and we're doing the best we can.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Eisenberg. I'll just let you take those one step at a time as we get to them. My understanding though is that the fundamental piece that we're being asked to do today is a non-roll up DIP approval on an interim basis where there would be cumulative draws under the interim period that could total 15 million and then a short draw of 10. It's not rolled up, but essentially it is priming. I don't know whether it primes anything that you all have, and the fees on it I did in my head, I think they're about 9- of the \$10 million. So --

MR. EISENBERG: Well, I didn't want to get into those details, Your Honor, but I did the same math and I asked the question: Why do we need this interim debt at this point right now on such short notice? But I'll leave that --

THE COURT: All right.

MR. EISENBERG: -- alone.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

Ms. Russell, I see that you have visually appeared. Let me see if you've also pressed five star on your line. If you wish -- I have somebody from the 917 area code, I'm going to go ahead and recognize them. I don't think that's you, Ms. Russell. If you wanted to talk, let me get you to press five star.

From 917-602-9986 who do we have?

MS. TSIOURIS: Yeah, hi, Your Honor. Good afternoon. It's Natasha Tsiouris from Davis Polk & Wardwell.

THE COURT: Good afternoon again, Ms. Tsiouris.

MS. TSIOURIS: Good afternoon. Well, I just wanted to take a moment to make a few brief statements before we launch into the rest of the presentation and just explain that -- our group is who we represent here.

So the Ad Hoc Group represents (indiscernible) covered it, but approximately 67 percent of the first lien term loans, 25 percent of the second lien term loans. This group has been a group of lenders who have been working with

the company, many of them have been working with the company in its last restructuring, and they've been involved in quite some time. They've had been working very constructively the company.

This particular group started to form in early March when the company approached its lenders about a potential waiver under various credit agreements. And they group came together very quickly and very cooperatively to help to provide that waiver. And then also Mr. Perez covered in his statement, you know, after the negotiations the first lien lenders and the second lien lenders that are approved are reaching forebear on the interest payments because the company (indiscernible) and to show further to the board for the company's long term success.

A few weeks after that we signed the forbearance agreements and also found out the person to which they quickly got to work going through diligence materials that are being (indiscernible) diligence session with advisors. And the lenders that have led up to the RSA.

There is -- remains a lot of work to be done. We are confident that the company, Apache, and our group have accomplished a great deal the past few months, and again, Mr. Perez noted, you know, the agreement that was reached in principle with Apache with respect to (indiscernible) obligation, and the Apache assets that were conveyed to the

Debtor in 2013 was pretty remarkable and came together very quickly and our group is fully supportive of. But obviously, as we've seen, reaches backstop \$100 million DIP financing that ensured that the company will transition (indiscernible) keep it and give that company — that they want assurance that they'll have sufficient liquidity going forward to restructure the operation properly and to do it over the next few months, which we think gives the company enough time to adequately repay all of its stakeholders.

And, you know, we do intend to work quickly, but we don't want the company (indiscernible) obviously, and we think that the liquidity share provided on day one gives the company that assurance and comfort that it can work through all the other creditors in addition.

So we do, you know, have a very strong commitment to this company, and we do recognize that a lot of work remains to be done under the RSA. But we think it was a very significant achievement and request to continue to be partners with the Debtors on a go-forward basis, so.

THE COURT: All right. Ms. Tsiouris, thank you for that opening.

MS. TSIOURIS: Thank you.

THE COURT: From 802-843-1260 who do we have?

MS. RUSSELL: Good afternoon, Your Honor. This is Robin Russell representing Apache Corporation and certain of

its affiliates. And Mr. --

THE COURT: So, Ms. Russell, I'm going to interrupt you for a minute. So this morning, or this afternoon I guess, when I started reading about what this case was about, I have no idea whether the deal with Apache works technically, whether I should approve it. But I said to myself, what brilliant person from Apache decided this was the right thing to do, this is such a good move to get an up front for having to do the P&A and get that solved instead of cases where it becomes the last issue resolved. And now I know, so.

MS. RUSSELL: Well, thank you, Your Honor. Apache has a very savvy general counsel, Anthony Lannie, have worked very hard over the last few months with our team which includes not only Hunton Andrews Kurth, but Parkman Whaley as our financial advisor, and P.J. Goodwine of Looper, who is our special BOEM and BSEE counsel.

We are committed to working with the Debtor and other constituents to implement the Apache term sheet and negotiate -- finish a few documents. We are going to do that in the next 75 days. And I'm available to answer questions, but that's all we have to say for this afternoon.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

No one else has asked to make an opening statement. So let me ask Mr. Perez or Mr. Barr where you all want to go in the case at this point.

MR. PEREZ: Your Honor, Alfredo Perez. We would move into evidence for the purposes of the first day hearings, both the declaration of Mr. Dane and the declaration of Mr. Hanson, and then the first matter is going to be the DIP motion and that's going to be handled by Mr. Carlson.

THE COURT: All right. So we have a motion to admit ECF Number 29 which is the declaration of Mr. Dane, and ECF Number 23 which is the declaration of Mr. Hanson. Are there any objections to the admission of the two declarations solely for the purposes of today's hearing, and they will need to be readmitted at any future hearing if we're going to apply them there.

(No audible response.)

THE COURT: All right. With no objections the two declarations are admitted. Does any party have any cross-examination for either Mr. Hanson or Mr. Dane? If so, please press five star.

MR. EISENBERG: Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Eisenberg, go ahead.

MR. EISENBERG: Thank you, Your Honor. I didn't know if my line still live. I'm trying to get the Debtors to stipulate to the fees we see, \$5 million of the \$10 million today, so I don't have to cross-examine Mr. Hanson.

MR. PEREZ: Your Honor, I'm happy to take Mr. Hanson through the -- how the fees were negotiated and what the fees

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

are. I think they're a little bit less than 9 million, but they're certainly not materially less. But if the Court -with the Court's permission I'd like to just ask Mr. Hanson a few questions so that we can have that -- the discussion about the fees and the amounts. THE COURT: Mr. Eisenberg, it's your request, do you mind doing it that way? MR. EISENBERG: No, I don't at all, Your Honor. Thank you very much. THE COURT: All right. And you said both Mr. Dane's name and Mr. Hanson's name, who do you want to give that testimony? MR. EISENBERG: Mr. Hanson. I apologize. THE COURT: No, that's okay. Mr. Hanson, would you raise your right hand please, sir. THE COURT: Do you swear to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, and before you answer I need to turn on your phone, so you need to press five star if you would. (Pause in the proceedings.) I haven't seen you come up yet with the THE COURT: five star, but if you just pressed it one time, that'll work. (Pause in the proceedings.) THE COURT: Can somebody tell me what -- I don't

```
1
         know, let me see.
2
                   MR. PEREZ: Probably a 203 number, Judge.
3
                   THE COURT: Okay. I'll find him.
4
              (Pause in the proceedings.)
5
                   THE COURT: So I'm having -- this is an internet
6
         connection problem here, give me just a second, let me get my
7
         controller restarted.
8
              (Pause in the proceedings.)
9
                   MR. PEREZ: Yeah, when you're ready I have various
10
         numbers here that I could help you with.
11
                   THE COURT: No, I think that this is -- it's just my
12
         own connection to -- there's a separated telephone control
13
         that --
14
                   MR. PEREZ: Your telephone --
15
                   THE COURT: -- that I need to get through the
16
         internet. It somehow went down, but I'm getting back up on
17
         it.
18
                   And I've got him now, I just need to click on him.
19
                   MR. PEREZ: Thank you.
20
                   THE COURT: Thank you.
21
                   All right. Mr. Hanson, so do you swear to tell the
22
         truth?
23
                   THE WITNESS: Yes, I do.
24
                   THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Hanson.
25
                   Go ahead, please, Mr. Perez.
```

1	DIRECT EXAMINATION OF JOHN-PAUL HANSON		
2	BY MR. PEREZ:		
3	Q Would you please state your name for the Record?		
4	A John-Paul Hanson, J-O-H-N hyphen P-A-U-L, H-A-N-S-O-N.		
5	THE COURT: Mr. Hanson, let me get you to pick up		
6	your phone or bring it closer to your mouth if you would,		
7	please.		
8	THE WITNESS: Is that better?		
9	THE COURT: It is a whole lot better. Thank you,		
10	sir.		
11	BY MR. PEREZ:		
12	Q Mr. Hanson, what is you involvement with respect to the		
13	Fieldwood matter?		
14	A I am seeking to be retained as investment banker and		
15	financial advisor to Fieldwood Energy.		
16	Q And, Mr. Hanson, are you did you conduct the process		
17	to obtain DIP financing in this case?		
18	A Yes, I (indiscernible).		
19	Q And did you file a declaration in connection with		
20	obtaining the DIP financing?		
21	A Yes, I did.		
22	Q And, Mr. Hanson, can you describe to the Court briefly		
23	what was the process that you undertook to obtain the DIP		
24	financing.		
25	A Starting with our initial retention and working with the		

Debtors we, as is typical, started looking at the company's operating plans, business plans, and forecasts. We noticed that there were upcoming forecasted periods where liquidity would be tied to negative based on forecasted cash flows and cash on hand.

At that point we started working with Mr. Dane and the finance team at Fieldwood as well as with AlixPartners to determine a potential liquidity need if we were to go out and raise third-party financing after sizing the liquidity need. We put together solicitation materials and reached out to third parties to provide that potential financing. That financing was sought to be raised on a debtor-in-possession financing basis. We reached out to a total of seven parties including two of the existing creditors/lenders to Fieldwood Energy.

- Q All right. And did you receive any proposals?
- A We did, we received two proposals.
- Q All right. And did you -- were you able to negotiate the proposals?
- A Yes, we negotiated several in each of two proposal counterparties.
- Q And why did the Debtor finally decide to go with the proposal provided by the FLTL lenders?
- A It came down to a number of factors, primarily the FLTL proposals were similar in size and amount, it did not require

a roll up of pre-petition close, and given the pre-petition existing intercreditor agreement among the existing lenders to Fieldwood Energy, it would not result in a non-consensual (indiscernible) and litigation around the provision of the DIP financing, which we viewed as being of substantial value to the estates.

Q Okay. So Mr. Eisenberg pointed out that the fees are approximately \$9 million. Can you go through the analysis of, first of all how, the fees were negotiated and then the analysis of the payments that are being made.

A The fees were negotiated -- the fees themselves and overall financing was negotiated at arm's length, both with our financial advisor to the FLTL group as well as directly with principals in the FLTL group. As mentioned, that was all conducted on an arm's length basis. It started with a very different, as you can imagine, proposal in terms of both fees and financing costs overall. Through a series of protracted negotiations where we resolved in terms of the fee side is a 3 percent up front fee, a 4 percent backstop fee, and a 3 percent unused loan fee, all charged against the 100 million of the DIP financing being provided.

THE COURT: Let me just clarify one thing so that I can get the Record right on this. My understanding is that the unused loan fee was payable monthly on unused amounts, but the other two fees were paid up front, so that if you were to

1 draw everything in theory at the end of month one, that unused 2 loan fee would only be 1/12 of 3 percent in total. Is that 3 right, or did I misunderstand how that works? 4 THE WITNESS: That's correct, Your Honor. I 5 appreciate the clarification. THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. 6 7 BY MR. PEREZ: 8 And, Mr. Hanson, do you believe that the Debtors were 9 able to obtain the best rate possible in connection with this 10 DIP loan? 11 Under the circumstances and given the protracted 12 negotiations and where we were able to finally negotiate the 13 fees and possibly the financing (indiscernible) that we 14 believe this the best outcome achievable. 15 Now there is an interim draw of \$10 million that has to 16 occur within 15 days. Do you know of any reason why this has 17 to be done? 18 It is really for two reasons. Number one, to solidify 19 the DIP financing, demonstrate to the market, to employees, to 20 regulators and members that the financing is fully available. 21 A secondary reason is, but of no less importance, is that 22 certain of the providers of the DIP cannot be providing 23 uncommitted funds, or making commitments on undrawn funds I

should say. And so there needed to be an initial draw in

order to seize the commitment to provide the entire

24

25

1	100 million should it be needed.
2	Q Now if the Debtors elected not to have the DIP now and a
3	DIP were not available in the future, would that have any
4	potential business impact on Fieldwood?
5	A It would have a dramatic impact on Fieldwood, both in
6	terms of immediate liquidity needs and you can see from the
7	DIP budget. But there are periods where liquidity becomes
8	tight under the forecasted 13 weeks, and the loss of liquidity
9	can have a material impact on long term value of the
10	operations and the underlying business.
11	Q Now are oil and gas companies in the Gulf susceptible to
12	significant liquidity swings?
13	A Absolutely. Oil and gas companies can be subject to very
14	significant swings, first and foremost due to the commodity
15	price, but also driven by a variety of other operational and
16	production factors. And the Gulf of Mexico producers are no
17	less, in fact, arguably they are even more susceptible.
18	MR. PEREZ: Thank you, Your Honor. We have nothing
19	further from Mr. Hanson.
20	THE COURT: Thank you.
21	Mr. Eisenberg.
22	MR. EISENBERG: Yes, Your Honor.
23	CROSS-EXAMINATION OF JOHN-PAUL HANSON
24	BY MR. EISENBERG:
25	Q Mr. Hanson, three months ago before the petition date,

```
1
         what was the available liquidity for Fieldwood?
              40 months ago -- I'm sorry, three months ago,
2
3
         Mr. Eisenberg?
4
              Yes, sir.
5
              If I recall, it was approximately 180 million.
6
              How much cash does Fieldwood have sitting here on day one
7
         of the budget that was provided?
8
              Approximately 135 million, that constitutes both
9
         international operations, as well as the liquidation of
10
         significant hedges which occurred in late May of this year.
11
              And the forecasted periods when you will have liquidity
12
         problems, those are not in the first 30 days after the filing
13
         of the bankruptcy -- or of that budget, sir.
14
              Not -- it depends on what you're classifying as liquidity
15
         problems, but within the next 30 days it is not forecasted
16
         that liquidity becomes dramatically tight, but there is a cash
17
         burn forecasted in the next 30 days.
18
              And so looking at the 13-week budget when does that
19
         liquidity problem that you talked about occur?
20
         Α
              Where liquidity becomes the tightest in the forecasted
21
         period is late September, early October time frame.
22
              So maybe eight weeks in.
23
              Correct, depending on a variety of factors including
24
         (glitch in the audio).
```

I'm trying to understand what roll up. I heard that

25

Q

1 there's no roll up at least on an interim basis. Is that 2 correct? Not under the presented and agreed to DIP financing. 3 4 There was under none of the competing proposals. 5 Okay. And so then -- and then there's a second tranche 6 that's available upon the satisfaction, I've got to get the 7 term right, there's a satisfaction event that occurs and 8 that's another \$15 million that would become available at that 9 point. Correct? 10 Well, there's 15 million of incremental availability 11 during the interim period, but prior to the signing of 12 definitive documentation around the Apache DIP agreement. 13 That 15 million is subject to conditions, but it is available 14 within the next 75 days should the company need it. 15 Is there a roll up on that amount, or any piece of this 16 DIP loan? 17 Not under this proposed DIP, no. 18 Okay. Now the fees, there's the initial 3 percent fee, 19 and then there's a 4 percent backstop fee. Can you describe 20 to the Court what a DIP backstop fee is? 21 That is a fee that is provided to the parties without 22 backstopping the full 100 million, so they are committing to 23 provide the full \$100 million DIP. 24 So they're just -- they're just parties who are providing

the DIP and they're getting an additional 4 percent because

25

1 someone else is not providing the DIP? 2 But it's an agreed fee in order to incentivize the 3 parties to provide the DIP financing which is necessary. 4 Well, let's talk about that. The second tier of the debt 5 structure, which is the term loan, that basically -- would you call the value of the offshore assets that have been marketed 6 7 by Houlihan would -- do you know whether the value was less 8 than the full amount of the term loan at this point? 9 MR. PEREZ: Your Honor, I'm going to object to the 10 question. I think it goes beyond the scope and it's not -- I 11 don't believe that this is an appropriate line of questioning 12 on a DIP hearing. 13 THE COURT: Does this relate to -- how does this 14 relate to the DIP, Mr. Eisenberg? 15 MR. EISENBERG: Certainly. My next question, Your 16 Honor, is, is it true that all these terms loans parties are 17 doing is supporting their own collateral and so it's in their 18 interest to actually do this, and why would they be entitled 19 to this backstop fee as part of this on such short notice when 20 the money is not there and there's no liquidity need. 21 THE COURT: Why don't you just go directly to that 22 question. 23 MR. EISENBERG: Okay. 24 BY MR. EISENBERG: 25 Q Isn't it true, Mr. Hanson, that all the term loan members

are doing is supporting their own collateral here?

A There's a subset of the FLTL lenders who are providing this DIP financing.

Q And they're supporting their own collateral. Correct?

A They are supporting the underlying difference which constitutes their collateral.

Q All right. So there a motion you understand today to give the employees comfort with regard to their wages. Are you aware of that motion, sir?

A Yes, it's part of the first DIP finance.

Q All right. And the \$10 million from the interim DIP is not necessary for the company to actually satisfy the needs of (glitch in the audio), sir.

MR. PEREZ: I object to the form of the question,

THE COURT: Overruled.

THE WITNESS: I'm not sure exactly which dollars are going to pay the employee wages. But the DIP as stated in my declaration provides comfort to the employees, vendors, other parties—in—interest that there's sufficient long term liquidity to support the operations and provide stand—by capital as necessary for the ongoing business on a long term basis.

BY MR. EISENBERG:

Q So the answer is no, the DIP is not necessary on an

1	interim basis to satisfy the cash needs under that motion
2	currently.
3	MR. PEREZ: Object to the form of the question
4	THE COURT: Sustained.
5	MR. PEREZ: Your Honor, as stated.
6	THE COURT: Sustained.
7	MR. EISENBERG: All right. I'll move on, Your
8	Honor.
9	BY MR. EISENBERG:
10	Q You mentioned that Fieldwood is a private company.
11	Correct?
12	A It is not publicly traded, correct.
13	Q And so it's not traded on an open market, is it?
14	A The equity is not publicly traded.
15	Q And sitting here today do have any reason to believe that
16	the term loan lenders will be unwilling to provide a DIP a
17	month from now?
18	MR. PEREZ: Object to the question, it calls for
19	speculation.
20	THE COURT: Sustained.
21	BY MR. EISENBERG:
22	Q Aren't you just speculating, Mr. Hanson, that another DIP
23	might not be available 30 days from now?
24	THE COURT: Same question. Sustained.
25	MR. EISENBERG: Well, Your Honor, I would I

JUDICIAL TRANSCRIBERS OF TEXAS, LLC

1 thought he testified on direct that he was -- they weren't 2 sure whether they could get a DIP 30 days from now, and so I 3 was trying to --4 THE COURT: I think he did, he said he isn't --5 MR. EISENBERG: He did? All right. THE COURT: -- he isn't sure. I don't think that's 6 7 speculating about anything to say, I'm not sure. 8 MR. EISENBERG: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor. I'11 9 withdraw the question. 10 THE COURT: Thank you. 11 MR. EISENBERG: That's all I have for right now. 12 Thank you, Your Honor. 13 THE COURT: Thank you. 14 Any further questions for Mr. Hanson? 15 (No audible response.) 16 EXAMINATION OF JOHN-PAUL HANSON 17 THE COURT: Mr. Hanson, this is a priming loan and I 18 understand that it primes the collateral of the existing 19 funded debt schedule that was shown to me. So the first out, 20 it primes the non-funding as well as the funding FLTs and it 21 primes the second lienholders. Does it prime M&M lienholders, 22 does it prime any security that might belong to 23 Mr. Eisenberg's client, or does it only prime if you will the 24 collateral stack that is to the three lenders that are funded

25

debt holders?

1 THE WITNESS: It primes the existing lenders to the 2 business. So you mentioned the collateral on the existing 3 funded debt. 4 THE COURT: So if, without any finding or even 5 allegation by Mr. Eisenberg's client, but I've also got a lot 6 of people that provided goods and services to the company. If 7 we were to approve the priming lien today, the collateral, or 8 the security interests or the collateral rights or the 9 statutory rights that the M&M lienholders might have or the 10 contractual rights that Mr. Eisenberg might have would be 11 unaffected by the priming part. They may be affected by the 12 existence of the debt, by the administrative claim, but not 13 affected by the priming part. Is that right? 14 THE WITNESS: That is correct. 15 THE COURT: Okay. I don't have any more questions. 16 MR. EISENBERG: Your Honor, that raised another 17 question for me, if I may? 18 THE COURT: Sure. Of course. 19 MR. EISENBERG: I'll just ask. 20 THE COURT: No, of course. 21 RECROSS-EXAMINATION OF JOHN-PAUL HANSON 22 BY MR. EISENBERG: 23 So the interim order, Mr. Hanson, does it provide 24 releases? 25 No, it does not provide releases.

```
1
              Okay.
         0
                   MR. EISENBERG: All right. Well, that's the only
2
3
         question that I had left.
4
                   THE COURT: Thank you.
5
                   All right. Mr. Perez.
                   MR. PEREZ: Thank you, Your Honor. We have nothing
6
7
         further for this witness.
8
              (Witness steps down.)
9
                   MR. PEREZ: May he be excused?
10
                   THE COURT: No, but he could be not testifying for
11
         another minute. I don't know what we might need him for
12
         today's first day hearings.
13
                   Can you stick around, Mr. Hanson?
14
                   MR. HANSON: Yes, of course, Your Honor.
15
                   THE COURT: Thank you. And I'm sorry to be rude
16
         about that, but we're trying to deal with this sort of in real
17
         time.
18
                   Mr. Perez, as you know, we had reserved time for you
19
         on Monday I believe, expecting these hearings then. I have no
20
         problem with what we're doing, but I also had some three
21
         o'clock hearings scheduled today. I don't think they're going
22
         to take that long. So I'm going to go ahead and call my three
23
         o'clock hearings, and then I'm going to come back to you all,
24
         if you all will just kind of stand by on the phone and on the
25
         GoToMeeting, that'd be great. I need to wait --
```

1 MR. PEREZ: Thank you, Your Honor. We will. Thank 2 you. 3 THE COURT: So we're going to take about a one or 4 two minute break. 5 Mr. Laws, if you will press five star and let me know when we can begin the BJ Services --6 7 (Recess taken from 3:06 p.m. to 3:18 p.m.) 8 AFTER RECESS 9 THE COURT: Mr. Laws, are we ready? 10 THE CLERK: Yes, Your Honor, we're ready. 11 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. 12 Okay. We're going to go back on the Record on the 13 Fieldwood case, it is 20-33948. I think this means that your 14 CourtSpeak will now be divvied up into segments, but you'll 15 get two different PDFs that will show that if you want 16 CourtSpeak. 17 All right. Go ahead, please, Mr. Perez. 18 MR. PEREZ: Yes, Your Honor. We have no further 19 testimony. Obviously we'd like to respond to some of the 20 arguments that Mr. Eisenberg made. 21 THE COURT: So we're dealing with the DIP motion, is 22 that it, and you're resting you evidence on the DIP motion? 23 MR. PEREZ: Yes, Your Honor. 24 THE COURT: All right. Is there any other party 25 that has any evidence on the DIP motion? Hold on one second.

Mr. Laws, do we have an issue?

THE CLERK: (No audible response.)

THE COURT: I guess not. Okay. I'm going to remute your line, Mr. Laws.

Sorry, everyone. We're doing all of our recording remotely into the sound system here in the courtroom and it's hard to communicate.

All right. So let me hear argument in favor of the DIP by any party that wishes to make it, the interim DIP, and then arguments against it by any party that wishes to make it.

MR. PEREZ: Yes, Your Honor. Alfredo Perez on behalf of the Debtors. Your Honor, I believe that the uncontroverted testimony is that that -- the Debtors have engaged in a process where they went out, they solicited bids, they got the best bid -- they got the best bid available, that they're -- that this is a business that has significant liquidity swings.

I think the Court can take notice of oil and gas — the volatility of the oil and gas markets in addition to being completely in the Gulf, and that based on Mr. — and the uncontroverted testimony, Your Honor, it is clear that having that liquidity, having that DIP available will be needed, that the testimony is that he didn't know whether that DIP would be available and there will be times when it will be needed.

Obviously, Your Honor, the fees were negotiated at

arm's length. Obviously we would all like to have had lower fees. Those were the fees that were available. And the other alternatives would have resulted in a potential priming fight which would have -- which would have had its own issues, not the least of which is the ability to prevail.

Your Honor, I think getting the DIP, having the funding as required both, you know, in order to show some stability but also be able to lock in the lenders as well as the testimony. It is important for this Debtor and I think that that's one of the three stools — the three legs of this stool that allow us to go forward with Apache, Apache (indiscernible).

And, Your Honor, I was reminded during the break that I mis-spoke during my opening. The deep water assets were purchased by Noble -- from Noble and I think I may have mentioned Apache and I apologize for that.

But, Your Honor, I think in connection with the interim DIP, which is what we're here to address, I think the uncontroverted testimony is, is that this is the best DIP available, that from a business standpoint is something that the company needs, and although the cost is relatively high, it's the best available at the time.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Perez.

Ms. Tsiouris.

MS. TSIOURIS: Thank you, Your Honor. So I just

want to echo Mr. Perez's comments and to say, no, first the DIP was part of the borrower commitment by the Ad Hoc Group to support the restructure and negotiation process that is still very much ongoing. They subbed in, despite of, you know, \$100 million commitment not knowing what the treatment will be for the DIP commitment, what will be upon the DIP loan, what will be the treatment further (glitch in the audio) LPL loan.

Second, I just want to highlight that this DIP does not provide any extra benefit for that offered first lien term loan position. And just to clarify when Mr. Eisenberg was talking to Mr. Hanson about a roll up, this -- and so maybe but not contemplate a whole lot now, it does not contemplate a whole lot more. I want to be very clear about that.

The adequate protection package that the first day term loaners are getting here are very professional. We've also agree not to seek ongoing strip payments in connection with their -- with the DIP package. And it goes into all first lien term lenders, and they have a very active (indiscernible). They have till August 14 to finance. And so that it, you know, incurred benefits -- it does not benefit the first lien term lenders that are providing extra benefits (glitch in the audio).

And we, you know, certainly aren't looking for any affirmative relief at the first day hearings. You know, what we are asking for is the interim draw be made within 15 days

as we go forward, and part of that is the funds that happen relative to (glitch in the audio) do have internal restrictions which, as you heard from Mr. Hanson, do not allow them to make open-ended commitments, so this was a necessary aspect of the deal.

We do think that, you know, it is important for this company for us and the parties that were committed (glitch in the audio) to the ongoing restructuring of this company that if it bears the market that we are (indiscernible) company, that the company has adequate funding for the rest of each (glitch in the audio) to actually effectuate an (glitch in the audio) restructuring. If we waited until later to provide this funding, it would be uncertain what the funding terms would be at that point, and whether or not the funding would be available at that point.

And so given all of that and, you know, the lender group is step up, and have stepped up and have done it in a way that -- in a way that (glitch in the audio).

THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Tsiouris.

Mr. Eisenberg.

MS. TSIOURIS: Thank you.

MR. EISENBERG: Yes, Your Honor. May I be heard?

THE COURT: Yes, sir.

MR. EISENBERG: Thank you, Your Honor. You know, the timing of this is very quick. The economics of it are

very tight right now, \$10 million for \$7-plus million in fees, the need for it is uncertain, the -- whether they would ever get to not be able to have a DIP, the evidence is -- doesn't go one way or the other. It did take several months to get to where we are now, according to testimony.

And so -- and -- but, you know, with the testimony that they're not cutting off rights, they're not giving any releases, they're not blowing this up, I'm not contesting whether or not they solicited properly or that this was the best bid. The question is whether they actually need it right now.

And so if Your Honor believes that they need it right now on the Record that's there, I don't know that that supports it, and -- but, Your Honor, I would like an opportunity to walk through the interim order offline and talk with various counsel about the particular provisions in it based upon the testimony and assure myself of the things that have been represented in court, just to mention the (glitch in the audio). And that's what I have right now on two hours notice, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Eisenberg, thank you for such an adult approach about what I probably am faced with right now.

We have jurisdiction over this under 28 USC Section 1334. This is a core matter under 28 USC Section 157. I'm going to announce a preliminary ruling, and I don't want to

hear people argue to me against this ruling.

Based on the evidence before me I think that taking out this loan is necessary for the effective reorganization of the Debtor and I'm going to approve it, but I'm approving it with I think some changes that aren't going to do any injury to the important goal that's trying to be accomplished. Based on the affidavits of Mr. Dane and Mr. Hanson, as well as the oral testimony, approving a \$100 million post-petition loan in today's environment adds such vitality to the case and to the likelihood of success of the case it should be approved.

This is a terribly unstable time. The availability of new capital in this marketplace in the oil and gas industry is sparse. I have either had the good or the bad fortune probably, certainly if you combine my experience with Judge Jones's experience to see more very large post-COVID loans than I think anyone else in the world. Maybe second to Jones, that's why I'm saying if you combine me with Jones, clearly we have.

This is the first post-COVID loan where I've seen competitive bidding for it, and it gives me a lot of comfort, and the end place where this loan ended up I think is just fine. It is expensive from a fee point of view but it's expensive from a fee point of view in an almost non-existent market which makes it a bargain from a fee point of view if you look at it the other way. It's not available at any

cheaper price.

I want to add three restrictions to the loan and to the documents, and I think these are consistent with the testimony, but I want you all to argue against it if I'm wrong. First, I want there to be a provision that deals with the M&M lienholders and that deals with other statutory rights holders and that deals with the rights of contract holders who aren't in the funded loan stack. And I want a provision in the interim order that whatever their collateral/lien/statutory rights are are not affected at the interim stage. I think the deal may be they're not even going to be affected at the final, but at least for interim I want that to be quite clear.

It goes hand-in-hand with the second one, which is want it very clear that what we are granting liens on are the same assets that the capital stack has. So those are basically two provisions to accomplish the same thing on an emergency basis.

The third thing is, I want to sign the order right away. Most orders signed by Bankruptcy Courts have a built-in 14-day stay, but most DIP orders have no stay at all. I want the order effective on entry, but I want the first -- I want it to be stayed as to when the first draw can be made and when the fees can be made until 10:00 a.m. on August 11. That would give Mr. Eisenberg, as well as other parties, more of an

opportunity to review it, and I don't really see anything in the testimony that says the cash is needed before then. As I understand Mr. Hanson's testimony, the first draw has to occur within 15 days, they'll have the first draw within 7 or 8 days, so I think it meets what he told me.

And essentially I'm doing this -- this was a deal getting put together more at the last minute than most first day things. I think one couldn't really get access to the information till about noon. And given what the testimony is, and I think no need for an immediate draw, but there is a need to have \$100 million loan approved, that that type of a stay only -- so people can only ahead and document it, you go ahead and get all your collateral documents filed, you can do all of that. But to not pay the fees or make the first draw till 10:00 a.m. on August 11 seems to be a protected device without much of a cost.

So with those three restrictions I think I should approve it, and I wanted to hear arguments against those, or in favor of those restrictions given where we are today.

MR. PEREZ: Your Honor, Alfredo Perez. I just want to ask a clarifying question. With respect to your second point -- I understand your first point and the color -- well, whatever of the second point, but there -- to the extent that there are any unencumbered assets obviously the DIP would have a lien over them, on any unencumbered asset. So I don't think

that's what the Court intended.

THE COURT: It is not, and that's fine.

MR. PEREZ: Correct. Okay. So that in essence there would be -- to the extent anyone has a prior lien or is entitled -- or that has a prior lien that isn't in the capital stack, they're not being primed. That's number one. Number two, with respect to other assets that are potentially unencumbered, they would have a lien on that.

And then, Your Honor, as a practical matter, Your Honor, I don't think that this would have funded before the 11th, and so the only hesitation that I have with actually the Court imposing a stay is what that does to the -- you know, part of the reason we did this is because some of the funds that are doing this can't have unfunded commitments. And as a practical matter we knew that they wouldn't be able to fund and that's why there's a 15-day repeal, that we have up to 15 days to fund.

So the 11th is certainly within the 15 days. The only concern I have, and I want to consult with counsel for the banks, Ms. Tsiouris, to make sure that that doesn't create an unintended consequence. As a practical matter, I don't think we were going to fund in any event before the 11th.

THE COURT: Yes, I was trying to fit into that and respect Mr. Eisenberg's argument simultaneously. It was not my intent to in any way impair the ability of that 100 million

to come in.

So, Ms. Tsiouris, does that delayed ability to actually pay the fees and draw the money for a week hurt anything?

MS. TSIOURIS: (No audible response.)

THE COURT: You need to un-mute your own line, Ms. Tsiouris.

MS. TSIOURIS: (No audible response.)

THE COURT: Oh, well, let me see. I apologize, I don't know how that happened, but your line is now active again. Go ahead.

MS. TSIOURIS: So I think what happened, my line dropped and so I missed two and three. But I apologize, I can't find -- I didn't hear it.

THE COURT: So here's the issue, what number one was, number one and number two were basically the same thing, saying I wanted to be certain that the priming didn't affect the M&M and the statutory rights holders, and therefore I wanted it clear not only that it didn't affect them, but here is what is primed as the capital stack. And then Mr. Perez has gotten clarity that in addition of course you can have a lien on unencumbered collateral. I was only really worried about the priming side.

But the third point was I wanted to go ahead and get the deal documented, people can sign things, you can record

things, you can have all of your agreements in place, but the actual first draw as well as the actual payment of the fees can't occur until on or after 10:00 a.m. on August 11, which is a week from today. And I think Mr. Perez's concern is that he knows that certain of your clients can't reserve funds that are unfunded and wanted to be sure that that wasn't going to get in the way of what your needs were. He also said from a practical point of view is isn't going to get drawn before then.

MS. TSIOURIS: Yeah, I think people understood there's always some, you know, some -- a little bit of some tiny issue with -- you know, in terms of the draw on funding and actual funding. So I just don't know what, you know, what the actual -- when it hits the point where it's too much. So I can get back to my clients and confer with them, but that amount of time that they're saying, it will get exercised.

THE COURT: Okay. Look, if there's a problem, would you all -- if you all submit an order without another hearing, I want it to have those things in it. It's not my goal to get in the way of the deal. If there's a problem, would you all request an emergency hearing?

Mr. Eisenberg, I think that resolves some of your bigger concerns. It may not resolve every concern, and I want to be sure that I have done that.

MR. EISENBERG: Well, it gives me an opportunity to

have the provision that we want, Your Honor, and to also review the order prior to its entry to make sure it's consistent with the testimony. So we do appreciate the Court's consideration today.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. So that'll be the ruling. I'm now going to transfer that from a preliminary ruling to a final ruling. It is subject of course to an emergency motion if what I've done has impaired the ability to draw the money. Not my intent.

Where do you all want to go? Mr. Barr, I'm going to reactivate your line, it looks like you had to reconnect as well.

MR. BARR: Thank you, Judge. I think we're going to turn it over now to Mr. Carlson who's going to complete the agenda.

THE COURT: So, Mr. Carlson, and I'm sorry to put you on the spot on this, but I'm going to, there was very short notice. What I would like to do is only what we need to do today, not what's convenient to do today. So if you'll take a minute -- and if you need to take a minute and talk to Mr. Dane or whenever, that's fine, but, and it may be that everything on the agenda has to be done today, and that's okay.

But I want to limit what we're doing to what really has to be done today, and then I will bring you back quickly

1 for the rest. And I can even look and see if I can do that 2 tomorrow. 3 (Pause in the proceedings.) 4 THE COURT: Yeah, anything that we don't get done, 5 that you can put off till tomorrow, I will bring you back 6 tomorrow morning at eight o'clock in the morning. So I want 7 to limit to what we need to do today. But again, the couple 8 of hours is awfully short. 9 Mr. Carlson, I'm not hearing you, so let me --10 (Pause in the proceedings.) 11 THE COURT: All right. From 713-546-5428, is that 12 you, Mr. Carlson? 13 MR. CARLSON: Yes, it is. Good afternoon, Your 14 Honor. 15 THE COURT: Good afternoon, Mr. Carlson. 16 MR. CARLSON: So, Your Honor, (glitch in the audio) 17 to do today (glitch in the audio) are insurance and our 18 motion. I just want to make sure I understand what the Court 19 is asking. (Glitch in the audio) we don't have (glitch in the 20 audio) is that -- is that --21 THE COURT: I'm having trouble with your --22 MR. CARLSON: -- if you --23 THE COURT: -- we're having trouble with your 24 phone, Mr. Carlson. 25 MR. BARR: Your Honor, if you could hear me, it's

Mr. Barr. I saw that (glitch in the audio) here now, so if you can hear me, I'm happy to go through, subject to Mr. Dane getting certified and Mr. Lannie getting certified to run the company, telling us that there are things that they actually need.

I would suggest that what we would need besides the DIP which you just approved, and thank you very much, would be cash management, which would be employee wages, Your Honor, and would be the NOL motion. Those three are probably, in looking through the list, the most important to get today, with the understanding that we're back on front of you very early tomorrow morning.

THE COURT: Let me start with Mr. Carlson to see if you want to overrule Mr. Barr. Your job is now --

MR. CARLSON: (Glitch in the audio) --

THE COURT: -- your job --

MR. BARR: And it's totally okay. No, it's not, it's totally okay if he overrules me.

MR. CARLSON: And he knows me better than that, Judge. So do you, but it's okay.

THE COURT: Yeah. Mr. Carlson, if you -- seriously, if you need to overrule him, go ahead.

MR. CARLSON: I think Mr. Barr hit the ones that we need today (glitch in the audio) in my mind.

THE COURT: Mr. Dane, do you want to overrule your

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

lawyer on this and tell me there's more important because -go ahead, let me get your line activated. Mr. Dane, would you press five star for me. All right. Mr. Dane, good afternoon. I know we haven't met before, and unfortunately welcome to Bankruptcy Court. Thank you, Your Honor. I would agree MR. DANE: with what Mr. Barr said also. THE COURT: All right. Thank you. All right. Then let's do those. Go ahead, Mr. Carlson. MR. CARLSON: Sure, Your Honor. And I'll actually turn to the podium over to Moshe Fink, who's going to be handling the wages. I was prepared for motions that are not essential for today. (Laughter.) THE COURT: All right. If you would press five star on your phone whoever's going to be handling these. (Pause in the proceedings.) THE COURT: All right. Who do we have? MR. FINK: Good afternoon, Your Honor. It's Moshe Fink from Weil Gotshal & Manges, proposed counsel for the Debtors. THE COURT: Good afternoon. I can't see you, are you on GoToMeeting? MR. FINK: So, Your Honor, I go -- on the screen

1 that I'm on I don't have the video capability, so I'm on 2 GoToMeeting but I am on the phone line as well too. 3 THE COURT: Okay. That's fine. I'm just going to 4 tell Mr. Perez to spring for a camera for him for next time. 5 MR. FINK: Thank you, Your Honor. 6 THE COURT: All right. 7 MR. PEREZ: I'll write a memo, Your Honor, I'll 8 write a memo. 9 THE COURT: Thank you. Go ahead, please. 10 MR. FINK: We'll find one tomorrow, no problem. 11 THE COURT: Go ahead, please. 12 MR. FINK: Thank you, Your Honor. So we're going to 13 start with cash management or with wages --14 THE COURT: Wherever you want --15 MR. FINK: -- or --16 THE COURT: -- wherever you choose to go. 17 MR. FINK: So, sure, Your Honor, I'll start with 18 cash management if that's okay, if it pleases the Court. 19 next item on the agenda would be Item Number 5, which is the 20 Debtors' cash management motion, document number six. By the 21 motion the Debtors request authority to maintain their cash 22 management system, bank accounts, pre-petition bank fees, 23 continuing business (glitch in the audio) in the ordinary 24 course, continue to do intercompany transactions in the

ordinary course and continue to retain corporate credit cards.

25

Your Honor, it's got more clearly in the motion and diagram annex to a motion. The Debtors have a relatively straightforward cash management system. It's tailored to their business needs and consists of six bank accounts, Your Honor. I would just point Your Honor just to flag that pursuant to conversations with the US Trustee the Debtors are asking for 45-day extension of the time period to come into compliance with Section 345(b) of the Bankruptcy Code. But that US Bank, which is the bank where a lot of the bank's cash management system is not an authorized counterparty. So we have requested that relief.

I'm happy to walk Your Honor through some more detail about the motion, but if Your Honor has any other questions, then I'm happy to respectfully request that the motion be granted.

THE COURT: All right. First, let me hear any objection to the cash management motion.

(No audible response.)

THE COURT: If anyone has an objection, if you would please press five star on your phone.

(No audible response.)

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Statham, are you able to hear me all right?

MR. STATHAM: (No audible response.)

THE COURT: Hold on. Mr. Duran, I'm going to get

```
1
         your line activated, I see you there.
2
              (Pause in the proceedings.)
                   THE COURT: Mr. Duran -- I don't know what happened,
3
4
         Mr. Duran. I'm going to get it active. There's something
5
         wrong on the system again.
6
              (Pause in the proceedings.)
7
                   THE COURT: All right. Mr. Duran, I apologize for
8
         the delay in getting you connected, but I think we should be
9
         able to hear you now.
10
                   MR. DURAN: Hector Duran for the US Trustee.
11
                   THE COURT: Mr. Duran --
12
                   MR. DURAN: Can you hear me, Your Honor?
13
                   THE COURT: I can. Mr. Duran, thank you for taking
14
         the time to appear today. I know it's a tough day and you
15
         certainly have our condolences.
16
                   MR. DURAN: Thank you very much for those words,
17
         Your Honor.
18
                   THE COURT: Mr. Duran --
19
                   MR. DURAN: The first --
20
                   THE COURT: Go ahead.
21
                   MR. DURAN: -- as far as the cash management
22
         motion is concerned, the Debtors incorporated all our comments
23
         and we're fine with the proposed order.
24
                   THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Duran.
25
                   When do you want finals, Mr. Carlson, since you were
```

```
1
         probably going to be in charge of picking that, when do you
2
         want your final hearing?
3
                   MR. FINK: Subject to the availability of
4
         Mr. Hanson, I would think the week of the 24th through the
5
         28th.
6
                   THE COURT: All right. Would you like to do it on
7
         the 24th at 1:30 in the afternoon?
8
                   MR. FINK: That works from my perspective, I just
9
         want to make sure that it works for you, Mr. Dane, Mr. Hanson.
10
                   THE COURT: Anyone have any --
11
                   UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It does, Your Honor.
12
                   THE COURT: -- objection to finals on the 24th at
13
         1:30?
14
              (No audible response.)
15
                   THE COURT: All right. Let me get that done right
16
         now and --
17
              (Pause in the proceedings.)
18
                   THE COURT: All right. I've signed the cash
19
         management motion. Let me get that sent to docketing. It has
20
         gone to docketing. Tell me where you want to go next.
21
                   MR. FINK: Thank you, Your Honor. Absolutely.
22
         Wages next if that's okay?
23
                   THE COURT: All right. Go ahead, please.
24
                   MR. FINK: So, Your Honor, the wages motion, Item
25
         Number 7 on the agenda, ties to Docket Number 13. Pursuant to
```

that motion the Debtors seek authority to pay pre-obligations, related fees, costs and expenses, and maintain and continue to honor and pay amounts with respect to the Debtors' prepetition business practice, purpose and policy to employees that were very close to the business.

As discussed in the motion, Your Honor, the Debtors' employees, approximately 635 FTEs consisting of both offshore employees and office employees. And, Your Honor, to keep it short, the employees the backbone of the company, that in the ordinary course of business the Debtors maintain the customary employee programs that Your Honor would expect to see in a motion like this, including health and welfare assets, retirement benefits and employee savings plans.

The Debtors seek to pay approximately 9.65 million in total estimated obligations, the vast majority of which consists of compensation obligations and benefits obligations.

Your Honor, just to give you one update that's occurring in real time is we need to close out one of the final comments of the US Trustee. The US Trustee has requested to add to the order that for the Debtors to be getting payment after the 25,000 an individual pursuant to any bonus program or severance program, the Debtors will provide five-days advance notice to the Trustee and the Committee.

And we'll put various information about the claimant -- about such payment (glitch in the audio). So, Your Honor, that's

occurring in real time and the Debtors will -- we will submit an order with that, a revised order reflecting that change that we negotiated in the last few moments.

THE COURT: So if I could do this, given how important it is to get the employees comfortable and paid, let me be sure I don't have any objection to any of this. Other than one provision requested by the US Trustee is there any party that has any objection to the employee wages motion?

(No audible response.)

THE COURT: All right. Based on sort of the obvious sense of this --

MR. DURAN: Your Honor --

THE COURT: Yes, sir.

MR. DURAN: -- Hector Duran for the US Trustee. I note that Paragraph 2 also not only includes the employee bonus programs and the employee severance obligations, it also includes a KERP. I would want to be notified in connection with the KERP as well.

THE COURT: All right. Let's do this then, if that's going to -- if there are no other objections I'm going to approve it. And if I could impose on you, Mr. Duran, I am going to type in the changes myself, if you will dictate them to me, and we'll just get them done.

MR. DURAN: All right, then.

THE COURT: Let me get this active.

(Pause in the proceedings.)

1

2 THE COURT: Go ahead. Can you see that on the 3 screen? 4 MR. DURAN: I can, Your Honor. 5 MR. FINK: I can as well, Your Honor. 6 THE COURT: Good. So, Mr. Duran, you want to 7 dictate to me. 8 MR. DURAN: Before making any payments in excess of 9 25,000 to any individuals pursuant to the employee bonus 10 program, KERP or the severance program the Debtors shall 11 provide five-days advance notice --12 THE COURT: Are those business or calendar days? 13 MR. DURAN: -- calendar -- to the US Trustee and 14 any statutory committee, A, entitled to claimant --15 THE COURT: I just missed a word you said. To any 16 statutory committee, and then go ahead. 17 MR. DURAN: And then A will be the entitled to 18 claimant, B the amount of the proposed payment to such 19 claimant, and C, proposed payment date. 20 THE COURT: All right. Does that work for the 21 Debtor? 22 MR. FINK: Your Honor, I think just one minor ting. 23 I believe the employee bonus program and severance program are defined terms in the motion. If we could capitalize the 24 25 employee bonus program and the severance program.

1 (Pause in the proceedings.) THE COURT: Does that work? 2 3 MR. DURAN: That works. Thank you, Your Honor. 4 MR. FINK: Yes, Your Honor, for me I would just 5 check with Mr. Perez just to make sure that he's also -- he's 6 also in agreement. 7 THE COURT: Mr. Perez doesn't get to participate in 8 this, he turned this hearing over to you and you're going to 9 do it on your own, sorry. 10 MR. FINK: I have to treat him nicely so he finds me 11 a video camera, so, you know, I've got to --12 THE COURT: Yeah. I don't. Yeah. 13 (Laughter.) 14 THE COURT: All right. I've signed the wages order. 15 Thank you. Thank you all for getting this done. 16 MR. FINK: Thank you, Your Honor. 17 THE COURT: I do think it's just essential that we 18 do as much as we can to keep the employees knowing that in a 19 second bankruptcy case they're still stable. I've signed that 20 order. 21 What do you want to take up next? 22 MR. BARR: Thank you, Your Honor. 23 Sorry, Moshe. 24 So it's Matt Barr. I think the only one today, just 25 given the importance of it also would be the NOL motion, the

net operating losses motion which are (glitch in the audio).

1

2 (Pause in the proceedings.) 3 THE COURT: All right. Who do we have from 4 917-806-5259? 5 MS. LIOU: That's correct. Good afternoon, Your 6 Jessica Liou from Weil Gotshal & Manges, co-counsel 7 for the Debtors. 8 THE COURT: Tell me your last name again, please. 9 MS. LIOU: It's Liou, L-I-O-U. 10 THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Liou. And, Ms. Liou, no 11 camera for you either? The Weil Gotshal firm is not springing 12 for that, huh? 13 MS. LIOU: No, not today, but next time I'll be more 14 prepared to appear. 15 THE COURT: All right. So, Mr. Dane, be sure these 16 cameras don't hit your bill. 17 Go ahead, please, Ms. Liou. 18 MS. LIOU: All right. Your Honor, the last item on 19 the agenda for today is Item Number 10. That was the motion 20 filed at Docket Number 8, that is the Debtor's emergency 21 motion. Quickly going through this motion, the Debtors are 22 seeking to protect the potential value of their time 23 attributes, including net operating losses that have been 24 carried forward and other tax reasons. 25 Just going through the motion, the Debtors have in

excess of \$ \$170 million in estimated federal NOLs, and \$460 million of estimated business expense carried forward. These are valuable assets of the estates, and if a change were to occur, or one goes back to production and claim without the (indiscernible) monitoring these valuable assets could be (glitch in the audio).

The motion seeks to put in place certain

(indiscernible) procedures that provide the Debtors an

opportunity to monitor the trading in the Debtor's common

stock and also a stockholder's (indiscernible) election to

claim the production. And the features are very plan vanilla,

something you would see in over 90 percent of the cases with

large Debtors where they keep the release.

Parties seeking to (indiscernible), the insurance for a claimed deduction will be required to provide 20 business days' notice to the Debtors. And the Debtors would have 15 business days to object or decide that given the insurance of the Debtors to consent to such a trade or a claiming of a regular stock reduction.

If, however, the Debtors choose to retract and there's ability for the parties to go before the Court and have the matter heard before the Court. A substantial stock holder subject and one of the provisions is any stock holder that would -- that currently holds 4.75 percent (glitch in the audio) would end up owning 4.75 percent of the stock. A

majority stock holder subject to the notice provisions related to (indiscernible) stock deductions would be any stock holder that holds 47.5 percent or more.

We did receive some minor comments from the US

Trustee's office, which we've put into the proposed interim

order. (Glitch in the audio) comments we have taken and just

to highlight for Your Honor, the two changes relate to

Paragraph 2 in the interim order. We added a sentence at the

end of the paragraph that clarify that any party-in-interest

may request emergency relief from procedure. And that is

common, but we've incorporated the change to Paragraph 6 about

the third line down. We clarified that the interim order

would be provided to not only registered holders, but also

non-holders of common stock.

And with that we believe that any (glitch in the audio) protecting these regarding the value of the Debtors' estates, and (glitch in the audio) and all the reasons discussed we would ask that the Court approve this motion.

THE COURT: So, Ms. Liou, it's one thing to ask me to restrict people from buying something that they don't have a property interest in, it's another to ask me to restrict people from selling something that they do have a property interest in. So with respect to notice, due process notice, can you tell me which shareholders you have, how many do you have, that are at 4.75 percent or greater who would be

affected by this order?

MS. LIOU: Your Honor, we believe we have roughly three shareholders that would be impacted, and all three of them we can easily get the notice to, they actually -- they are current board members of the company.

THE COURT: So if there's --

MS. LIOU: (Glitch in the audio).

THE COURT: -- if they are all three current board members, did they approve the filing of this motion as the board?

MS. LIOU: Yes, they did.

THE COURT: Yeah, then I think that's pretty good notice to them. So that was my worry --

MS. LIOU: Yes.

THE COURT: -- was due process notice. Okay.

Let me ask if there's anyone that objects to this relief.

(No audible response.)

THE COURT: All right. Given that the people who are affected by this have authorized the filing of this as members of the Board of Directors, I think due process is, in fact, satisfied and I have no concerns doing this on the first day. Due process matters if you're going to affect somebody's property rights.

In terms of restricting people from buying interest

in a company in bankruptcy, I really don't have much hesitation about notice, I just want to be sure that the notices are all going to be put up. And I assume this will hit -- will you all be doing an 8K so that people will know about it?

MS. LIOU: Yes, the company (glitch in the audio), so I don't believe an 8K is necessary. But, Your Honor, I actually do want to clarify for the Record that we're not restricting people from taking any action, we're just requiring they provide notice to us for these procedures. And to the extent that the Debtors don't consent, there could later be a restriction for (glitch in the audio) or a court order issued by you (glitch in the audio).

THE COURT: No, I think you are restricting people from doing something. If you tell somebody you can't sell your stock for 20 days, I mean unless you're going to guarantee to them that you're going to honor any losses they have, then you're potentially hurting those people and they have a right to notice. But --

MS. LIOU: That's true, Your Honor.

THE COURT: -- I want to be sure you get notice out to anybody that's going to be selling it so that they are obliged to tell their buyers what's happening. So how are you going to give notice -- you're right, you're not public so this isn't going to be a normal 8K, how are people going to

know --

MS. LIOU: Right. So on that --

THE COURT: -- that they can't buy the stock?

MS. LIOU: Right. So, Your Honor, in Paragraph 6 we do provide not only for our whole service with instructions that go down to the beneficial holders of common stock. There are also publications.

THE COURT: All right.

(Pause in the proceedings.)

THE COURT: All right. I'm going to continue the balances. I understand that from the Debtors' point of view we're okay doing this. I'm continuing the balance of the matters till 8:00 a.m. in the morning to allow parties-in-interest to organize any opposition that they might have to the requested relief. That will put us in sort of a normal frame of first day motions.

Mr. Perez, you apologized to me at the beginning of the hearing for the shortened notice. And that is necessary. I mean you were working hard and you have a complicate, very complicated deal you were putting together. As I told you at the beginning of the hearing, I read this stuff and I know I didn't absorb it all just going through the first read. It's hard. And so I had problem that things are happening at the last minute. I just want to protect people's rights to come in and objection to it. So I'm glad that you all can wait

till 8:00 in the morning to finish the rest of the things.

I hope, Mr. Barr, the technology issues didn't terribly interfere with your ability to participate, but storms happen and so we just all have to deal with it.

Mr. Dane --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. DANE: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: -- do you have anything you need to add or comment on, do you have any questions about what we're doing or why things were occurring today as they were?

MR. DANE: (No audible response.)

THE COURT: I think your line remains open, Mr. Dane.

MR. DANE: Thank you, Your Honor. I don't, I just wanted to thank everyone very much for their time today. Things have been very challenging period (glitch in the audio) and our employees are supposed to be dealing with the (indiscernible) and professionals, and if we had stakeholders. I particularly want to express our appreciation to the folks at Apache, and I want to echo Ms. Russell's comments about the talent over there and the dialogue in which we were able to engage.

And then just lastly, Your Honor, if I could have one more moment, I just wanted to send a quick message to our employees at Fieldwood.

THE COURT: Go right ahead.

MR. DANE: Thank you. So we're fortunate that we had some time this morning to hold a town hall with our employees and explain our structuring. I think Mr. Fink did an excellent job of describing the employees as life blood of the company, because we do have a group of talented employees that are hard working and dedicated at Fieldwood.

My main message that I want to reiterate here for Your Honor, for our team, is first and foremost we stress that it's absolutely critical that we continue to focus on safe operations and what we like to call flawless execution. We have a very challenging business. These needs are absolutely remain paramount in the eyes of all of our employees and we really ask that -- we didn't want this process to distract from keeping ourselves as safe as possible.

Secondly, we talked about the fact that a couple of our main objectives during our restructuring is to, one, preserve jobs, and also have entities that would be able to continue as a going concern, even if some of those entities look different than Fieldwood today.

And as Your Honor mentioned, this is obviously a very complex case, it has a number of uncertainties, but it was recommended as the executive leadership team to making a very active and open and transparent dialogue with our employees. So I wanted to thank Your Honor again for time today, and I want to remind our employees one more time to

1 continue being as safe as possible in everything that they do. 2 THE COURT: Mr. Dane, what a great comment. Thank 3 you. 4 All right. I'm going to go ahead and adjourn the 5 Fieldwood hearings till 8:00 o'clock in the morning. And 6 we're going to start our 4:00 o'clock hearings. If you all 7 would, you can just hang up because I'm going to leave all the 8 technology connected up for the 4:00 o'clock hearings. 9 Thank you. 10 MR. PEREZ: Thank you, Your Honor. 11 THE COURT: Thank you. 12 MR. BARR: Thank you. 13 (Hearing adjourned at 4:09 p.m.) 14 15 I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript 16 to the best of my ability due to the condition of the 17 electronic sound recording of the telephonic proceedings in 18 the above-entitled matter. 19 /S./ MARY D. HENRY 20 CERTIFIED BY THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF 21 ELECTRONIC REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS, CET**337 22 JUDICIAL TRANSCRIBERS OF TEXAS, LLC 23 JTT TRANSCRIPT #62465 24 DATE FILED: AUGUST 6, 2020

25